

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 09/921,263 08/02/2001 Frederic Garcon PM00053 8691 EXAMINER 23416 7590 10/24/2003 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP KALLIS, RUSSELL P O BOX 2207 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WILMINGTON, DE 19899 1638

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1 4 11 11 11	A (! 4/ - )
Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/921,263	GARCON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Russell Kallis	1638
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.		
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
B. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.		
D. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
0. Other:		
o omor		AAND
		ASHWIN D. MEHTA, PH.D
	•	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: reasonable doubt of the enablement of the inventions of Claims 1-18 is clear because Applicant has not shown the presence of the transgene in the putatively transformed tissue and because the methods used allows for selection of resistant cells without the presence of the transgene. Further, no guidance has been provided for identifying or evaluating the broadly claimed genus of genes for tolerance to HPPD inhibitors and the prior art does not support Applicant's broad claim to this genus. Furthermore, the functionally linked HPPD encoding DNA in the amendment to Claim 1 raises new prior art issues by changing the scope.